

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 124 296

PS 008 641

TITLE Title XX: Social Services in Your State. A Child Advocate's Handbook for Action.
 INSTITUTION Children's Defense Fund, Washington, D.C.
 PUB DATE Apr 76.
 NOTE 31p.
 EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; Community Action; *Community Programs; Day Care Programs; Early Childhood Education; Elementary Secondary Education; Financial Support; *Guides; *Program Planning; *Program Proposals; Project Applications; *Social Services; *State Federal Aid; State Programs; State Surveys
 IDENTIFIERS *Title XX

ABSTRACT

This booklet is a guide for those wishing to route Title XX money into the community programs for children. Part I discusses ways for child advocates to participate in four key stages of the Title XX planning process in their state: planning proposals, raising the 25% non-federal share of the funds required by Title XX, and publishing proposed and final plans. Legal requirements states must meet in each of these stages are described. Part II raises questions involved in the delivery of services, including funds, eligibility, fees, services, advisory committees, and child day care services. In Part III strategies for influencing existing state Title XX programs are outlined. Examples of effective child advocacy in Kansas, Texas, and Illinois are reported in Part IV. Appendices include: (1) Title XX Federal Allocations, Use, and Median Income, by State, (2) Child Day Care Expenditures in First Program Year, by State, (3) State Agencies for Title XX, and (4) H.E.W. Regional Offices. (SB)

 * Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
 * materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
 * to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
 * reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
 * of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
 * via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
 * responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
 * supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TITLE XX: SOCIAL SERVICES IN YOUR STATE

A CHILD ADVOCATE'S HANDBOOK FOR ACTION

published by The Children's Defense Fund

April 1976

INTRODUCTION

Title XX of the Social Security Act, which became effective on October 1, 1975, provides money to your state for a broad range of social services programs. Those programs may include such services as child day care, homemaker services, services to the handicapped, protective services, legal services, senior citizens programs, and information and referral. Each state is allotted a share of \$2.5 billion in federal funds, which can be used to pay 75 percent of the costs of social services included in that state's Comprehensive Annual Services Plan. To get the federal money, the state must raise the other 25 percent, through state appropriations or through donations from public or private agencies.

The federal government does not tell your state how to spend its Title XX money. It does prohibit use of Title XX funds for major medical or subsistence (i.e. room and board) costs, sets maximum limits on eligibility, and requires certain administrative and record-keeping procedures. But within these broad guidelines, the state is free to define its own services, to determine who will receive them, and to contract with service providers--including local community groups.

Title XX is not a totally new program. It replaces the social services programs previously authorized under Titles IV-A and VI of the Social Security Act. The \$2.5 billion was available to states under these sections of the law and, in fact, a number of states were already spending their share of the national ceiling before Title XX became effective.

What is new about Title XX is the requirement that your state undertake an open public planning process. This gives you a chance to find out what the state is doing with your social services dollars and to organize so that children and families get their fair share. If your state is already spending all of its Title XX funds, this may mean working to shift priorities within the plan. If you have unspent federal funds, you may have to concentrate on finding the money to pay the state's 25 percent matching share.

The emphasis in Title XX is on community-based services. Whether or not your community groups can get these funds, and whether you can serve children with the greatest need, will depend on what the plan says. The Children's Defense Fund has prepared this Handbook to help you influence that plan.

PART I: THE PLANNING PROCESS

Before it can receive Title XX funds, your state must prepare a Comprehensive Annual Services Program Plan (CASP). This plan must contain specific information about the types of services the state will fund, eligibility, fee schedules, geographic areas where services will be offered, sources of the state's matching funds, and the administration of the program. Federal law requires that this planning process be an open one, and that the public have the opportunity to participate in it.

There are several key stages in the planning process where you should be involved. You should not wait until the plan is published to try to change it. That may be too late.

A. THE PRE-PUBLICATION PHASE

No later than 90 days before the start of a new program year, your state must publish a proposed plan for public comment. However, by that time, the most important decisions about the social services program already may have been made. It may be much easier to influence the plan before it is published than to try to change it during the comment period.

1. The Needs Assessment - In developing its plan, your state must consider the needs of all residents and all geographic areas of the state. This assessment is to take place before a proposed plan is published.

The federal government does not say how the needs assessment is to be done. In many states, in the first year it was an informal collection of information rather than a careful analysis and documentation of what services were needed, what was available, and where the gaps existed. For example, some states simply circulated questionnaires and asked interested citizens to check which services they thought were most important in their community. In other places, public meetings were held. Still another form of "assessment" was to ask various state agencies to identify needs. Obviously, the results of such random assessments depend directly upon the ability of specific interest groups to weight the process in

- 3 -

their favor. Thus, if chfld care advocates fill out the most questionnaires, or have the largest attendance at public meetings, then the assessment will show child care to be a high priority need.

Some states are beginning to develop more systematic methods for assessing needs. Particularly where this is the case, the needs assessment will have significant influence on the proposed plan. Whatever the process, this is a critical stage for child advocates to make certain that the state agency has strong documentation of the needs for children's services and that those needs are given full attention in the development of the proposed plan.

2. Raising the Non-Federal Share - To get federal Title XX funds, your state must have one dollar for every three dollars it claims. If this matching money is not available, then it will not make much difference what services are included in the plan or how high the eligibility levels are set.

One source of matching money is state appropriations. The process and the timing for appropriating state funds differ from state to state. Generally, at the beginning of a new session of the state legislature, the Governor submits a budget which includes whatever money he/she wants appropriated for social services. Responsibility for acting on the budget is assigned to one or more committees in each house and ultimately, the entire legislature votes on the level of state funding for the program.

Advocates must make certain that the budget which the Governor submits is adequate to meet the needs for children's services and that the budget which the legislature ultimately approves includes all of those funds. Many legislatures will complete action on the budget before the proposed social services plan is published. You must know when and how the appropriations process works in your state.

Not all matching funds come from state appropriations. States may use -- and some require -- county and local funds. Some states accept private donated funds -- from United Way or other community fund-raising activities. At the same time you are trying to influence the state plan, you should be attempting to raise local or private matching funds, and should make certain that the state agency will accept such funds as part of the non-federal share. (Obviously, this is not necessary

if you are certain that the state appropriation is high enough to meet the entire matching requirement.)

Again, even if the state plan finally includes the children's services you need in your community or allows the expansion of those services, if you do not have the matching money and cannot get it from the state, the plan may not mean very much. Further, the state agency may refuse to include such services in the plan unless it is clear that the matching money is available.

B. PUBLICATION OF THE PROPOSED PLAN AND THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.

Your state's proposed plan must be published at least 90 days before the new program year begins. Some states start their new program year on July 1 -- which means their proposed plans must be published by April 2. In other states the program year begins on October 1, so there the proposed plans must be published by July 2. (Appendix A shows the beginning of the program year in each state. However, some states have indicated they may change their program year; you should check with your state agency to make certain the date is still the same as it appears in this Handbook.)

You have a right to see your state's plan. At a minimum, federal law requires that your state do the following.

On April 2 or July 2 (depending on your state's program year), a display ad must appear in the newspaper of widest circulation in your area, and in foreign language newspapers if that is appropriate. This ad will tell you:

- where and how to comment on the proposed plan,
- the toll-free number to call for a free detailed summary of the plan,
- the address of a local public office (for example, the post office or the court house) where you can get the summary, and
- the address of the local public office where you can look at the complete plan and can purchase it at a reasonable cost.

(If you miss the ad, you can get all of this information by contacting the State office listed in Appendix C, or you may be able to get it at the local welfare office. Most public libraries keep back issues of newspapers -- you can also check there.)

You also have a right to submit to your state agency written comments on the plan, for at least 45 days after it is published. All of the comments which the state receives must be made available for public inspection.

Although public hearings are not required by federal law, in the first year many states did hold such hearings in order to receive citizen reactions to the plan. You should insist on such hearings, with wide advance notice to the public, and should make certain that children's interests are adequately represented whenever these hearings occur.

Remember, both the quality and the quantity of the comments, submitted in writing and presented at public hearings, will have an impact on the final plan. They should be specific, and they should come from a variety of interested persons -- consumers, providers, and concerned citizens. Copies of your comments and testimony should be sent to other influential people in your community and state; for example, the governor, your state legislators, your Congressperson or Senator, your local newspaper, the regional office of HEW. They can help you get the changes you seek.

C. AFTER THE FINAL PLAN IS PUBLISHED

Following the 45-day comment period and before the beginning of the new program year, the state must publish its final plan, using the same procedures (display advertisements, toll-free telephone numbers, distribution through local public offices) as for the proposed plan. The state agency must explain any changes that were made, and must summarize the public comments it received.

Your job is not over once the final plan is published. On the contrary, this is perhaps the most critical time for aggressive advocacy on behalf of children.

1. Monitoring the Plan - It is up to you to find out how the plan is working -- whether the state is actually

providing the services described in the plan, and what kinds of problems are developing. This is essential to assure that families in your area receive the services to which they are entitled and that community institutions have an opportunity to provide those services. It is also crucial that you know how the current plan is working in order to work for improvements, either through amendments to the existing plan or through changes in the plans for next year:

2. Amending the Final Plan - The state may make changes in the plan even after it is published in final form. To do this, the state agency must publish a proposed amendment and follow the same public procedure as it did when it published the proposed plan in the first place -- except that the period for public comment is 30 days. The state must go through this formal amending process in order to make any substantial changes -- for example, to provide a new service, to change eligibility, to create a fee schedule, to expand a service into a new geographic area.

Amendments can be made at any time during the program year. If you did not get everything you wanted in the final plan; then you should work to amend the plan -- using the evidence you can collect through monitoring to support your arguments. In addition, you should watch for amendments proposed by others, and be prepared to comment on them if they will affect children's services.

PART II: WHAT TO LOOK FOR IN YOUR STATE'S
SOCIAL SERVICES PROGRAM

This section of the Handbook is divided according to the major issues which will affect the delivery of services to children. It suggests questions for you to ask about your own state's program; you will think of others. You can get some answers by looking at the plan, but to get a complete picture of what is actually happening, you will need to talk to the state agency, to providers, and to recipients of services.

A. THE FUNDS

(See Appendix A for figures on your state's allotment and its planned expenditures for the first program year.)

1. Is your state planning to use its full allotment of federal funds? If not, why not?
2. Did your state actually use all of the federal money it estimated it would use in this year's plan? If not, why not?
3. Does your state plan to spend any more for social services in the coming year? the same? less?
4. Where is your state getting its matching money now?
 - (a) From state appropriations? How much? Did the state agency get as much as it requested from the state legislature?
 - (b) From county or local funds? How much?
 - (c) From private contributions? If so, from what sources?
5. Will there be any change in the source of matching in the coming year?

6. Is the state having difficulty raising its matching share? If so, has it explored all possibilities? Is there any surplus in the state treasury? Is the state willing to use private donated funds?
7. Are Title XX funds fairly distributed within the state? Are areas with the greatest need (e.g., concentration of low-income families, lack of current services) getting the largest share?

B. ELIGIBILITY

1. How much money can a family have and still get services? What does the percentage of median income mean in actual dollars? (See Appendix A for your state's median income. Eligibility can be set at any point up to 115 percent of that figure.)
2. Are there any eligibility requirements in addition to income?
3. Do these income (and other) limits exclude any children and families who are presently receiving services?
4. Do these limits exclude children and families who need services? If so, how would you change them?
5. How does eligibility for children's services (for example, child care) compare with eligibility for other services? Is it fair?
6. Who determines eligibility? Is the process efficient? If not, how can it be improved?
 - (a) Has the state delegated eligibility determinations to providers of services?

(b) Are the forms as simple as they can be? Is the state asking for more information than the absolute minimum necessary to determine eligibility? (Federal regulations permit the state to use a simple self-declaration method, without elaborate documentation or verification of income.)

7. Is the state providing information and referral services and protective services for children without regard to income? Do protective services include such things as child care?

C. FEES

1. Is there a fee schedule for services? for children's services specifically?
2. How do fees for children's services compare with fees for other services? Are they fair?
3. At what income level does the state start charging fees? Is that too low? too high? (The state must charge a fee if income exceeds 80 percent of the median.)
4. How much will the fees be? Will the state be charging families more than they can afford to pay?
5. Do the fees take into account family size?
6. Is there a maximum total fee for a family receiving more than one service?
7. Will the fee schedule discourage families from using services?
8. Is there any danger that use of a fee schedule might operate to shift services away from the poorest families for whom the state must pay the entire bill?

D. SERVICES

1. What services for children and families are provided for your community?
2. Are these the services which are most needed?
3. Are there any needed services which are missing from the plan? Are they available to families in other parts of the state?
4. Does the plan describe the services well enough to understand exactly what will be provided in your area? Does it tell how many people will be served? Who will be eligible? Whether there will be fees charged? Who will provide the services?
5. Will the plan allow expansion of services in your area or does it only include those services which are already there?

6. Does the state provide any technical assistance to community groups who are trying to provide services?

E. ADVISORY COMMITTEES

1. Does your state have an advisory committee on social services?
2. Who is on the committee? How are they selected? How many are child advocates? parents? community representatives?
3. How often does the committee meet? Are its meetings open to the public? Are minutes of the meetings available?

F. CHILD DAY CARE SERVICES

This section suggests additional questions to ask about child care specifically. They could be modified for other children's services which you might want to examine in more detail. (See Appendix B for details on child care taken from the states' first year plans.)

1. Are there special eligibility conditions for child care in addition to income limits? (For example, must both parents work? Can students qualify? Is it limited to single-parent households?)
2. Is child care available only to let parents work, or can it be provided for other purposes? (For example, for retarded or handicapped children, in circumstances of family stress, as a protective service to prevent neglect or abuse.)
3. How much is being spent on child care in your state? How much is being spent per child? (You can get a very rough idea of this by dividing the total dollars being spent by the number of children being served.) Is this per child expenditure adequate to assure quality care?
4. What is the level of reimbursement a child care provider receives? (This is usually a payment per child per day.) Does it vary from place to place within the state? Is it adequate to pay for good care? Are providers receiving their payments from the state on time?
5. Where are services being provided? In centers? In family day care homes?
6. Are the child care facilities licensed? Are federal child care standards being met? What is the ratio of staff to children?

7. Are child care services meeting particular family needs; for example, for infant or school-age care? for night-time care?
8. Are the subsidized facilities distributed within your community and state so that they are available where the need is?

PART III: STRATEGIES FOR INFLUENCING YOUR STATE'S TITLE XX PROGRAM

A. GET YOUR FACTS TOGETHER

1. Do Your Own Needs Assessment - Put together specific, detailed evidence about the needs for children's services in your community, geographic area, and/or state. Interview child care operators to find out about waiting lists. Conduct a survey of parents to find out what kind of services they need and want, and what kinds of problems they have in finding those services (e.g. none available, too expensive, not eligible). Do a survey of agencies providing services for children to find out where they are, what they are offering, and what is missing. Evaluate the quality of care children are receiving. Analyze Census Bureau data, talk to manpower agencies, interview employers, to determine how many working mothers there are who need child care services.

2. Analyze the Current Title XX Plan - Identify the strengths and weaknesses of the current state plan. Decide which provisions you need to change, and which ones you may have to fight to retain. Find out whether the state is actually providing the services described in the plan.

3. Develop Your Priorities for Action - Decide which problems need the most attention first. For example, is it most important to expand eligibility? to install (or get rid of) a fee schedule? to change policies on use of private matching funds? to raise reimbursement rates for child care? to provide additional services? Prepare specific recommendations for the state agency, using the evidence you gathered in your needs assessment to support your arguments.

B. GET YOUR FRIENDS TOGETHER

This is not a job you can do by yourself. There are probably lots of individuals and groups who will help, if you find out who they are and get them together.

1. Locate All of Your Potential Allies - For example, if your issue is child care, begin with other child care programs in the state. Be sure to involve parents -- they are your most important resource. Other groups which have a

direct stake in child care -- like women's organizations and labor unions -- are natural allies, as are the churches and other organizations traditionally concerned with human services. You will probably find also that many of your concerns about the state plan are shared by groups interested in other services, like the aged or the handicapped. Elected officials and other public figures can be particularly helpful in getting access to the state agency and in generating publicity.

Get a name for your coalition -- it helps the state agency and the press keep track of who you are and what you are doing.

2. Set Up a Communications System - Once you have located all of your allies, you have to be able to keep them informed. And you must be able to mobilize them to action on short notice -- when there are letters to write, comments to file, meetings or hearings to attend, rallies or marches to organize. If the group is large and spread around the state, it might be practical to set up a network of key individuals whom you can contact and who, in turn, can get in touch with the rest of the people in their own parts of the state. You may find it useful to start a simple newsletter.

C. GET THE MEDIA INVOLVED

Your local newspaper, radio and television station are always looking for news stories. Get them to write or talk about your activities, and get them to do their own stories about the effect of Title XX on programs, children and families in your community. Invite reporters to your meetings. Get television cameras into your child care centers. Take advantage of local "talk shows" to discuss Title XX.

D. GET A COMMITMENT FROM THE STATE AGENCY TO INCLUDE YOU IN THE TITLE XX PROCESS

If you are going to influence what the state agency is doing, you have to know what is going on. Set up a meeting with a top official in the state agency and get a commitment to include you in the process at every stage. Demand invitations to planning sessions, direct participation in the needs

assessment, advance notice of public meetings and hearings and, especially, formal membership on any planning or advisory committees. Your own representatives in the state legislature and other elected officials can be especially helpful here. You should ask them for their support.

The calendar on the following pages suggests a timetable for your activities. If you have not already done so, get started today.

A TITLE XX CALENDAR FOR CHILD ADVOCATES

[Note: This calendar is based on a Title XX program year beginning July 1. If your state's year begins on October 1, change the months accordingly. October becomes January, April 2 is July 2, etc.]

OCTOBER	NOVEMBER	DECEMBER	JANUARY	FEBRUARY	MARCH
State budget is prepared. Title XX agency submits recommendations to Governor for appropriations for state matching funds for coming fiscal year.	Governor's office completes work on budget for coming fiscal year.	Governor submits budget to state legislature.	Legislature holds hearings on budget; votes on appropriations for coming fiscal year. (Exact timing will vary from state to state)	Needs assessment in process. Title XX agency begins drafting new Title XX plan for coming program year.	Meet with state agency to get your recommendations into the proposed plan, and to discuss the planning process. Get dates and places for hearings.
Preliminary work begins on needs assessment for coming program year.	Start your own needs assessment.	Submit your needs assessment to the state agency.	Meet with state agency to discuss its needs assessment; get a timetable for their assessment.	Meet with Title XX agency to discuss budget recommendations. Submit your own "estimates" of appropriations needed.	Submit evidence to state legislature about need for appropriations for Title XX matching. Meet with your own legislators. Testify at hearings on the budget.
					Write to all legislators in support of the Title XX appropriations.
					If state appropriations will not be adequate to cover matching requirements, start raising other funds from local and county officials and from private sources.

APRIL	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUGUST	SEPTEMBER
PROPOSED PLAN IS PUBLISHED	ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS ARE DUE	Proposed plan is revised, based on information received during comment period.	Amendments to plan may be proposed at any time between now and next July 1, with 30-day comment period.	Get the final plan; note any changes; Identify problems which may necessitate amendments.	Continue negotiations with state agency for amendments to plan. Watch for other amendments and file comments if the changes concern you.
		Public Comment Period (Hearings may be held at the state's option)		Meet with state agency to negotiate changes in the plan.	Monitor implementation of the plan.
				Get and analyze the proposed plan. Notify interested groups about substance of plan. Get time and place of hearings on the plan.	Submit written comments. Testify at hearings.

PART IV: EXAMPLES OF EFFECTIVE CHILD ADVOCACY

A. KANSAS

The Kansas experience demonstrates the importance of (1) early involvement in the state's planning process, (2) a statewide network of child advocates, (3) direct efforts to raise local matching funds, and (4) cooperation with agencies interested in other types of social services.

The Wichita Child Day Care Association, an established non-profit organization, serves as an umbrella for the delivery of child care services in that city and maintains a network of child advocates around the state. That network includes child care operators, parents and interested organizations such as women's groups and churches.

When Title XX became law in January 1975, the Association went to the state agency, through its representatives in the legislature, and demanded a role in the state's planning process from the outset. The agency agreed, and the Wichita group used its access to maximize involvement of child advocates across the state. Thus, when the state agency invited the Association to an early planning session, more than 50 advocates from all parts of the state appeared. When the agency announced it would hold 36 hearings across the state as part of its prepublication needs assessment, the network was used to publicize the hearings and to organize participation. In some areas, child advocates were the only people to attend. As a result, the state concluded that child care was one of the services which people in Kansas needed most.

After publishing the proposed plan, the state agency scheduled three hearings at the state capitol. Child care providers, parents, and other advocates participated in all of those hearings, from beginning to end. The success of these activities is evidenced in the final Title XX plan in Kansas, which includes \$11.9 million for child care and extends services to more families through the use of a fee schedule at higher income levels. Child advocates are working now to raise reimbursement rates.

In addition to this statewide mobilization, the Wichita Association was at work in its own county, raising local matching funds for child care and developing a coordinated approach to the state plan. To avoid competition for limited

funds, the Association turned to the Community Planning Council of the United Fund. The Planning Council agreed to hold a series of meetings at which all service agencies and interested groups worked together to develop priorities for services in the county, drawing together facts and statistics to support those services. From that process came a multiple services proposal for the county, which was submitted to the state agency; much of it was incorporated into the state plan.

In response to the overwhelming interest shown throughout the state, once the first plan was finalized, the state agency created a task force to develop a five-year plan for child care. That task force included 15 individuals from the network, including two from the Wichita Association. That long-range plan has been completed and will form the basis for adjustments to the Title XX program in the coming years.

For further information, contact:

Wichita Child Day Care Association
216 East Second Street
Wichita, Kansas 67202
316/265-0871

B. TEXAS

In Texas, efforts by child advocates to influence Title XX began well before the federal law was enacted. Child care providers contracting with the state agency under the old Title IV-A system had already organized an association to deal with the federal law and the Texas Department of Public Welfare. In addition, a statewide mobilization known as Child Care '76 was underway, to increase the visibility of child care as a public issue.

Closely watching the progress of the proposed Title XX legislation at the federal level, these groups went to work in the state legislature and the state agency to assure that Texas would be ready to implement the new law. By the time Title XX took effect in October 1975, state legislation had been passed to deal with issues like pre-payments to providers and audit systems. What is more, child advocates had achieved statewide recognition for their knowledge of Title XX. They were in a strong position to claim full representation on the state's Advisory Committee on Social Services, and were included on each of nine Task Forces set up by the state agency to examine various aspects of Title XX and to prepare the state's plan for social services.

The influence of child advocates was reflected in the proposed plan, in the percentage of funds allotted for child care, the decision to prevent refinancing of state expenditures for services, and the expansion of eligibility from an originally proposed level of less than 40 percent up to a finally agreed level of 60 percent of the state's median income.

Once the proposed plan had been published, advocates used the public comment period to focus on what they had identified as the single largest remaining problem with the plan -- the fee schedule, which failed to give adequate consideration to the wide variations in living costs throughout a state as big and diverse as Texas. The short-term effect of those efforts was to eliminate all fee schedules for the first program year. They are working now to devise a flexible fee schedule which will meet federal requirements.

Since publication of the first year's final plan, child care providers formed a coalition with other services providers, particularly with family planning and senior citizens groups, to work on Title XX issues in the state and to influence federal policies on issues such as eligibility determination.

Child advocates attribute their success in Texas to two factors: first, a sophisticated communications system which linked providers, parents, and individuals and groups broadly representative of the community; and second, serious homework on Title XX issues and developments in Washington, which have made child advocates the most informed participants in the state's planning process. In the words of one leader of the effort, the Title XX planning period was a "time of confusion" and "child care groups controlled the confusion."

For further information, contact:

Child Care 76
818 East Fifty-third
Austin, Texas 78751
512/451-7361

C. ILLINOIS

In Illinois, leadership on Title XX came from a non-profit community-based child advocacy group, the Day Care Crisis Council of Chicago. The Crisis Council includes child care providers, staff, and parents, and a range of women's organizations, civic, neighborhood and church groups, which represent a cross section of the entire community.

The Illinois advocacy effort was characterized by early involvement; persistence, even after the final plan had been published; development of specific proposals as alternatives to the state plan; effective publicity; and mobilization of broad support from all parts of the state, including among others the director of the state's Office of Child Development, the State Advisory Committee on Day Care, and members of Congress and the state legislature. Demands for changes in the plan went not just to the state Title XX agency, but to the Governor as well.

At the outset, the Council insisted on public hearings as part of the state's needs assessment process and then, a second set of hearings once the proposed plan had been published. Attention at these hearings focused on eligibility for child care. The proposed plan would have limited child care to purposes directly related to employment or training. The Crisis Council developed its own five categories of eligibility for both single and two-parent families -- protective services in cases of actual or potential child abuse, services necessary for the parents to maintain employment, services necessary because of retardation or medical or psychological needs of the child, services to allow parents to enroll in training or to seek employment and for students, and preventive services to avoid family stress. That proposal was circulated statewide. Virtually every witness at the hearings spoke in favor of it and the State Day Care Advisory Committee endorsed it. The final plan included the five classifications developed by the Council.

Another central issue was the question of fee schedules. Witnesses at the hearings testified in support of fees at a level which eligible families could afford to pay. However, the final plan included a fee schedule which left some families paying as much as \$26 a week for Title XX child care. Child advocates mounted an immediate protest, in the form of communications to state agencies and the Governor, particularly by

parents, and through the press. At least one member of Congress joined in that effort. In response to the overwhelming public pressure, the state amended its final plan to set a maximum fee of \$11 a week for a family, regardless of the number of children in care.

Presently, the Council is working to simplify the eligibility forms which the state is requiring applicants to complete, to protect the confidentiality of the information collected for Title XX purposes, and to keep it out of the state's computerized welfare information system. The Council has developed its own eligibility form which it is pressuring the state to adopt, and it has real hope of success.

For further information, contact:

The Day Care Crisis Council
201 North Wells, Room 642
Chicago, Illinois 60606
312/332-1721

APPENDIX A

TITLE XX FEDERAL ALLOCATIONS, USE, AND MEDIAN INCOME - BY STATE

	FY76 ALLOCATION (in millions)	ESTIMATED FY76 USE (in millions) ¹	FY77 ALLOCATION (in millions)	FY77 MEDIAN INCOME (for family of four)
* Alabama	\$ 42.25	\$ 42.25	\$ 42.30	\$ 12,805
Alaska	4.00	3.90	3.975	19,368
Arizona	24.50	9.55	25.45	15,230
Arkansas	24.25	19.76	24.375	11,890
California	245.50	245.50	247.25	15,931
Colorado	29.00	29.00	29.525	15,629
Connecticut	36.75	36.75	36.525	16,476
Delaware	6.75	6.75	6.775	15,231
* District of Columbia	9.00	9.00	8.55	15,093
Florida	91.50	91.50	95.675	14,788
* Georgia	57.00	57.00	57.725	13,666
# Hawaii	10.00	10.00	10.025	17,069
Idaho	9.25	9.25	9.45	14,075
# Illinois	133.75	133.75	131.65	16,350
# Indiana	63.25	30.60	63.025	14,478
Iowa	34.50	34.50	33.775	14,371
Kansas	27.25	27.25	26.85	14,395
Kentucky	39.75	39.75	39.70	12,514
# Louisiana	44.75	44.75	44.525	12,600
# Maine	12.25	12.25	12.375	12,552
Maryland	48.50	48.50	48.425	16,650
Massachusetts	69.25	69.25	68.60	15,630
* Michigan	107.75	107.75	107.575	16,174
* Minnesota	46.50	46.50	46.325	15,792
Mississippi	27.25	12.60	27.475	11,562
Missouri	56.75	54.05	56.50	13,770
# Montana	8.50	8.50	8.70	13,686
Nebraska	18.25	18.23	18.25	13,364
# Nevada	6.50	6.30	6.775	15,357
New Hampshire	9.50	9.22	9.55	13,986
New Jersey	87.75	87.75	86.70	16,727
* New Mexico	13.25	13.25	13.275	12,143
* New York	217.50	217.50	214.20	15,169
North Carolina	62.75	62.75	63.425	13,183
# North Dakota	7.50	7.50	7.525	15,005
Ohio	127.75	127.75	126.975	15,121
# Oklahoma	31.75	31.75	32.05	12,645
# Oregon	26.50	26.50	26.80	15,013
Pennsylvania	141.75	141.75	139.975	14,489
Rhode Island	11.50	11.50	11.075	14,404
South Carolina	32.50	32.50	32.925	13,055
* South Dakota	8.25	7.68	8.075	12,824
Tennessee	49.25	49.25	48.825	12,788
* Texas	140.50	140.50	142.50	13,924
Utah	13.75	13.75	13.897	14,003
* Vermont	5.50	5.50	5.55	13,145
Virginia	57.25	57.25	58.05	15,130
Washington	40.75	40.75	41.10	15,401
# West Virginia	21.50	21.50	21.175	12,569
Wisconsin	54.50	54.50	54.00	15,398
Wyoming	4.25	3.71	4.25	14,833

* Program year begins October 1.

No new program year until July 1, 1977

All other states begin program year on July 1, 1976

1/ from the states' final Comprehensive Annual Services Program Plans published October 1, 1975, as analyzed by the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (HEW). These are estimates and do not necessarily represent actual expenditures.

APPENDIX B

CHILD DAY CARE EXPENDITURES IN FIRST PROGRAM YEAR, BY STATE

	CHILD CARE EXPENDITURES (in millions)	CHILD CARE AS % OF TOTAL PROGRAM	NUMBER OF CHILDREN SERVED	AVERAGE COST PER CHILD	ELIGIBILITY	% AT WHICH FEES ARE CHARGED
* Alabama	\$ 16.51	29.4%	17,848	\$ 925	55%	
Alaska	.44	10.8	530	\$35	AFDC/SSI	
Arizona	4.05	42.2	10,825	373	61	
Arkansas	8.56	41.7	3,276	1,623	79	
California	46.90	18.3	55,440	\$46	94	50%
Colorado	5.74	19.9	9,660	198	80%	53
Connecticut**	8.05	18.5	7,360	1,098	115	46
Delaware	3.72	55.2	2,350	1,585	76	48
District of Columbia	2.90	21.3	3,475	912	80	50
Florida	14.25	8.9	12,660	1,124	60	39
Georgia	17.84	24.3	14,704	1,213	61	
Hawaii	7.00	29.5	4,853	1,442	60	
Idaho	.45	5.1	974	458	80	
Illinois	95.89	30.7	179,000	536	80	52
Indiana	10.45	14.6	4,050	2,581	50	
Iowa	3.93	11.4	18,836	209	80	
Kansas**	8.25	30.0	5,160	1,599	115	80
Kentucky	2.80	6.5	2,350	1,061	80	22
Louisiana	22.22	23.7	43,931	506	48.4	
Maine	4.50	15.4	3,801	1,131	80	
Maryland	12.36	24.4	6,825	1,811	105	40
Massachusetts	21.57	23.6	19,545	1,104	69	
Michigan	41.17	28.7	44,600	925	80	22
Minnesota	9.88	15.9	28,381	348	115	60
Mississippi**	5.99	48.0	2,439	2,457	115	80
Missouri	9.57	17.4	55,751	262	80	
Montana	2.57	14.6	2,208	1,501	150% of AFDC	
Nebraska	3.91	22.5	2,400	1,666	62	44
Nevada	.63	4.5	6,935	91	63	
New Hampshire**	5.00	32.9	2,614	1,151	80	55
New Jersey	37.82	32.7	25,984	1,455	80	
New Mexico	5.22	30.0	5,915	1,353	49	all
New York	158.98	52.2	75,750	2,099	80	
North Carolina	26.70	34.4	36,328	735	100	65
North Dakota	.27	2.1	515	519	80	40
Ohio	25.46	18.8	58,871	430	80	51
Oklahoma**	14.72	19.9	42,404	347	80	50
Oregon	(Day Care not identified as a separate service in plan)				115	80
* Pennsylvania	57.65	30.6	19,868	2,903	115	80
Rhode Island	1.57	15.2	5,644	278	54	
South Carolina	7.55	16.0	4,500	1,678	80	
South Dakota	1.46	12.4	2,917	1,862	60	40
Tennessee**	8.52	17.5	19,160	445	70	46
Texas	34.16	18.4	21,757	1,570	60	
Utah	2.42	16.5	4,000	604	74	AFDC needs standard
Vermont	2.27	51.1	1,640	1,583	80	50
Virginia	9.60	17.4	27,367	350	50	
Washington	6.55	16.2	13,056	502	32	
West Virginia	5.42	24.3	7,601	713	80	57
Wisconsin**	10.94	9.0	9,900	1,105	100	64
Wyoming	.75	20.1	6,000	125	60	

* Figures are for a 12-month first program year

** Figures are for a 21-month first program year

All other figures are for a 9-month first program year

Colorado Number of children served and per child cost are for one quarter only

Nebraska HEW could not establish per child estimates

State plan does not distinguish between child day care and adult day care

Note The figures in this chart include only what state's specifically identified as "day care for children". There may be other child care included in other services, such as "special services for handicapped children", "protective services", etc.

Source Technical Notes #3, #4, and Appendix, prepared by Office of Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, January 1976 - based on analysis of final state plans

YOUR STATE AGENCY FOR TITLE XX.

Mrs. Julia Oliver, Commissioner
 State Department of Pensions and Security
 64 North Union Street
 Montgomery, Alabama 36104

Dr. Francis S. L. Williamson, Comm.
 Dept. of Health and Social Services
 Putch H
 Juneau, Alaska 99801

William J. Mayo, Director
 State Dept. of Economic Security
 1515 West Jefferson
 Phoenix, Arizona 85005

Dr. Roger B. Bost, Director
 Dept. of Social and Rehabilitation Serv.
 406 National Old Line Insurance Bldg.
 Little Rock, Arkansas 72201

Mario Obledo, Secretary
 State of California Health and
 Welfare Agency
 915 Capitol Mall, Room 200
 Sacramento, California 95184

Henry Roley, Exec. Director
 Department of Social Services
 1575 Sherman Street
 Denver, Colorado 80203

Edward M. Maher, Commissioner
 State Welfare Department
 110 Bartholomew Avenue
 Hartford, Connecticut 06106

Mr. Earl McGinnes, Secretary
 Dept. of Health and Social Services
 Delaware State Hospital
 New Castle, Delaware 19720

Mr. Joseph Yeldell, Director*
 Department of Human Resources
 District Building
 14th and E Streets, N.W.
 Washington, D.C. 20004

William J. Page, Jr., Secretary
 Dept. of Health and Rehabilitative Serv.
 1323 Winewood Boulevard
 Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Mr. T. M. Jim Parham
 Acting Commissioner
 Department of Human Resources
 State Office Building
 Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Andrew I. T. Chang, Director
 Dept. of Social Services and Housing
 P. O. Box 339
 Honolulu, Hawaii 96809

Dr. James A. Bax, Administrator
 Department of Health and Welfare
 State House
 Boise, Idaho 83720

James L. Trainer, Acting Director
 Department of Public Aid
 222 College Street
 Springfield, Illinois 62706

Wayne A. Stanton, Administrator
 Dept. of Public Welfare
 State Office Building, Room 701
 100 North Senate Avenue
 Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Kevin Burns, Commissioner
 Department of Social Services
 Lucas State Office Building
 Des Moines, Iowa 50319

Dr. Robert C. Harder, Secretary
 Dept. of Social and Rehabilitation
 Services
 State Office Building
 Topeka, Kansas 66612

Mr. C. Leslie Dawson, Secretary
 Department for Human Resources
 Capitol Building Annex - Room 201
 Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Dr. William H. Stewart, Comm.
 Health and Human Resources
 Administration
 Post Office Box 44215
 Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804

David E. Smith, Commissioner
 State Department of Health and Welfare
 State House
 Augusta, Maine 04330

Richard A. Batterton, Secretary
 Dept. of Human Resources
 1100 North Eutaw Street
 Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Jerald L. Stevens, Commissioner*
 Department of Public Welfare
 600 Washington Street
 Boston, Massachusetts 02111

Dr. John T. Dempsey, Director
 Michigan Department of Social Services
 Commerce Center Building
 300 South Capitol Avenue
 Lansing, Michigan 48936

Vera Likins, Commissioner
 Minnesota Dept. of Public Welfare
 Centennial Building
 658 Cedar Street
 St. Paul, Minnesota 55155

Max M. Cole, Commissioner
 State Dept. of Public Welfare
 P. O. Box 4321
 Fondren Station
 Jackson, Mississippi 39216

Cleighton Penwell, Director
Department of Human Resources
318 Public Service Building
Salem, Oregon 97310

Mr. Frank S. Beal, Secretary
Department of Public Welfare
Health and Welfare Building
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

John J. Affleck, Director
Dept. of Social and Rehabilitation Serv.
Aime J. Forand
State Office Building
600 New London Avenue
Cranston, Rhode Island 02920

Dr. R. Archie Ellis, Commissioner
Department of Social Services
P.O. Box 1520
Columbia, South Carolina 29202

Dr. Frijthjof O. M. Westby, Secretary
Department of Social Services
State Capitol Building
Pierre, South Dakota 57501

Horace Bass, Commissioner
State Department of Public Welfare
204 State Office Building
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

Raymond W. Vowell, Commissioner
State Department of Public Welfare
John H. Reagan Building
Austin, Texas 78701

Paul S. Rose, Executive Director
Department of Social Services
221 State Capitol
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114

Thomas Davis, Secretary
Agency of Human Services
State Office Building
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

William L. Lukhard, Commissioner
Department of Welfare
8007 Discovery Drive
Richmond, Virginia 23288

Charles R. Morris, Secretary
Department of Social and Health Services
Post Office Box 1788
Olympia, Washington 98504

Mr. Thomas R. Tindér, Commissioner
Department of Welfare
1900 Washington Street, East
Charleston, West Virginia 25305

Wilbur J. Schmidt, Secretary
Dept. of Health and Social Services
1 West Wilson Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

Harvey Peterson, Act. Coordinator
Dept. of Health and Social Services
State Office Building West, Rm. 317
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82001

Lawrence L. Graham, Director
Department of Social Services
Broadway State Office Building
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

Theodore P. Carkulis, Director
Dept. of Social and Rehabilitative Serv.
Post Office Box 1723
Helena, Montana 59601

Mr. Alan Ihons, Director
Department of Public Welfare
1526 K Street, Fourth Floor
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

Roger S. Trouday, Director
Nevada State Dept. of Human Resources
Union Federal Building
308 North Curry Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701

Frank E. Whaland, Commissioner
Department of Health and Welfare
State House Annex
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

Mrs. Ann Klein, Commissioner
Dept. of Institutions and Agencies
135 West Hanover Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Richard W. Heim, Exec. Director
Health and Social Services Dept.
Post Office Box 2348
PERA Building
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87503

Steven Berger, Commissioner
Department of Social Services
1450 Western Avenue
Albany, New York 12203

David T. Flaherty, Secretary
Department of Human Resources
325 N. Salisbury Street
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

T. N. Tangedahl, Exec. Dir.
Social Service Board of North
Dakota
State Capitol Building
Bismarck, North Dakota 58501

Raymond F. McKenna, Director
Ohio Department of Public Welfare
30 East Broad Street
State Office Tower
32nd Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Lloyd E. Rader, Director
Dept. of Institutions Social and
Rehabilitative Services
Post Office Box 25352
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73125

APPENDIX D

YOUR H.E.W. REGIONAL OFFICE

Region I - (Maine, Vermont
New Hampshire
Massachusetts
Rhode Island
Connecticut)

Robert F. Ott
Associate Regional Commissioner, CS
John F. Kennedy Federal Building
Government Center DHEW/SRS
Room 1300
Boston, Massachusetts 02203
(617-223-6867)

Region II - (New York
New Jersey)

Dr. Melvin Herman
Associate Regional Commissioner, CS
Federal Building DHEW/SRS
26 Federal Plaza, Room 3840
New York, New York 10007
(212-264-4626)

Region III - (Pennsylvania
Delaware
Virginia
West Virginia
District of Columbia)

Maurice Meyer
Associate Regional Commissioner, CS
Gateway Building, DHEW/SRS
36th & Market Streets
Post Office Box 7760
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19101
(215-596-1316)

Region IV - (North Carolina
South Carolina
Georgia
Florida
Kentucky
Tennessee
Mississippi
Alabama)

Edwin E. Schultz, Acting
Associate Regional Commissioner, CS
DHEW/SRS
50 Seventh Street, N.E.
Room 746
Atlanta, Georgia 30323
(404-526-3476)

Region V - (Ohio
Indiana
Illinois
Michigan
Wisconsin
Minnesota)

Eli Lipschultz
Associate Regional Commissioner, CS
DHEW/SRS
30th Floor - 300 S. Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312-353-4239)

Region VI - (Texas
Louisiana
New Mexico
Oklahoma
Arkansas)

Dr. Peggy R. Wildman
Title XX Coordinator
DHEW/SRS
1200 Main Tower, 20th Floor
Dallas, Texas 75202
(214-655-4155)

Region X - (Washington,
Oregon
Idaho
Alaska)

Region VII - (Missouri
Kansas
Nebraska
Iowa).

Region VIII - (North Dakota
South Dakota
Montana
Wyoming
Colorado
Utah)

Region IX - (Hawaii
California
Nevada
Arizona)

Richard McConnell
Chief Program Representative, CS
Arcade Plaza Building, DHEW/SRS
1321 Second Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98101
(206-442-0526)

Bill Weisent
Associate Regional Commissioner, CS
Federal Office Building DHEW/SRS
601 East 12th Street, 5th Floor
Kansas City, Missouri 64106
(816-374-5975)

Fred Lund, Acting
Regional Social Services
Program Director
Federal Office Building, DHEW/SRS
19th and Stout Streets, Room 11037
Denver, Colorado 70202
(303-837-2141)

Charles R. Hall
Associate Regional Commissioner, CS
Federal Office Building, DHEW/SRS
50 Fulton Street, Room 469
San Francisco, California 94102
(415-556-7800)

The Children's Defense Fund
1520 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202-483-1470)

and

P. O. Box 1684
Jackson, Mississippi 39205
(601-355-7495)

(The Children's Defense Fund is a nonprofit organization of lawyers, federal policy monitors, researchers and community liaison people dedicated to long-range, systematic advocacy and reform on behalf of the nation's children. We welcome contributions from the public. Your donation is tax-exempt.)

This Handbook may be revised and reproduced for use in your community.